

Broad Run Farms Flood Emergency Access Study

Public Meeting and Polling Response Comments

General

Q: Why was the report prepared by General Services and not some other department?

A: The report was prepared by the US Army Corps of Engineers working with General Services as this department has a significant role in stormwater management for the County.

Q: Who would pay for the construction of the proposed alternatives?

A: Funds for constructing any selected alternative would compete for available local funding through the County's budget process.

Community Involvement

Q: Why didn't the County talk with more citizens in that only 10 of the 60 persons affected were attempted to be contacted?

A: The Corps of Engineers, as part of the study plan, was interested in sampling anecdotal information concerning flooding in the area. The Corps attempted to contact 10 households, but was only successful in reaching one or two. Technical information gleaned from official documents coupled with cross sectional river profile studies formed the basis of the report. Further development of the planning alternatives would include a public process to ensure the involvement of the residents.

Q: Will the County do anything more without further public input?

A: Staff works under the direction of the Board of Supervisors (BOS). The BOS is sensitive to citizen concerns and does not act without public input. Should the BOS desire to implement the alternatives outlined in the study report; a public process will be established.

Q: Why was the community not involved in the preparation of the flood study as they were in the landfill?

A: The planning-level study identified the various flood stages and developed technical solutions put forth as planning alternatives to enhance emergency access. Should the Board of Supervisors desire to further develop the alternatives, affected citizens will be given opportunity to comment on proposed actions.

Q: Why was a response solicited from the whole community when only a small portion of Broad Run Farms residents are affected?

A: While only a portion of residents may be directly affected, the entire community was contacted. Of the 144 responses to the selection of "Preferred Choices", there were 48 identified to be within the study area (portion of the Broad Run Farms residential development which is subject to flooding), based on addresses on the return envelopes.

Broad Run Farms Flood Risk and Emergency Access Survey Results
(Surveys received within the study area, 48 total)

ALTERNATES	1 ST CHOICE	2 ND CHOICE	3 RD CHOICE
#1	33	2	10
#2A		1	
#2B			
#3A			
#3B			
#4	1		
#5	8	23	6
#6	6	11	19
#7			2
#8		1	
#9		2	2

Alternatives

Q: Regarding the nature trail, who was the proponent of this alternative? Was it Parks & Recreation?

A: The creation of Alternative # 4 for a nature trail was developed by US Army Corps of Engineers independently of the County's Department of Parks, Recreation, and Community Services (PRCS).

Q: Why select Alternative #5 when the problems are the result of Potomac River floods, not flash flooding from Broad Run?

A: As stated in the Study, Alternative #5 could be utilized alone or in conjunction with other alternatives. It is a low cost alternative that would provide flood warning without regard to the source of the high water.

Q: What will be the impact of elevating Young's Cliff Road on those further upstream? Will this not adversely affect others not currently affected by BR floods?

A: The elevation of the road described in Alternative #2 listed adverse impact on surrounding properties as one of the principal disadvantages of the alternative.

Q: Can the public assume that Alternatives 5 & 6 are the only ones for further investigation?

A: The Board of Supervisors, Public Safety Committee, at its October 17th meeting withdrew its previous direction to the staff to report on implementing Alternatives 5 & 6. The Committee directed the emergency planning staff to review the current, countywide, emergency response plans to ensure that the plan was adequate to address any potential situations in the Broad Run Farms area.

Q: Why is a trail proposed which divides a property and not be along the edge of a property?

A: In the planning study, the alignment of Alternative #3 is generalized without specific alignment being investigated in detail. The purpose is to provide a generalized corridor such that emergency access via this alternative could be compared with other alternatives.

Emergency Access

Q: How many entrances are there to the Broad Run Farms?

A: While there are several entrances to Broad Run Farms subdivision, there is only one access road to the “portion of the Broad Run Farms residential development which is subject to flooding”.

Q: Why is there such concern about inadequate time to evacuate when the problem is “river flooding”, not “flash flooding”?

A: The purpose of the flood risk study was to document the type of flood risk and extent, followed by a comparison of plausible alternatives for emergency access.

Q: Why is there concern about the ability of helicopter landing when there is plenty of open land?

A: Operations of emergency helicopter landings require adequate clear space and operating conditions and can be significantly affected by bad weather conditions.

Q: Why does the County not have a “preparedness plan” in place?

A: The County has an emergency response plan that addresses countywide actions to be taken during various kinds of significant emergencies.

Flooding

Q: Why does the County not have a county-wide comprehensive flood plan?

A: Overall flood plain management is beyond the scope of this emergency access study. The questions concerned with flood plain management and planning have been directed to the appropriate County agency for response apart from this access study. Department of Building and Development is responsible for floodplain management.

Q: Why were the homeowners not asked for their LOMA's in the preparation of the analysis?

A: The level of detail in LOMA is not required for this emergency access study.

Q: Why was there no mention of the BRWRF (LCSA's “Broad Run Water Reclamation Facility”) and its impact to the Broad Run Farms community?

A: LCSA has determined that any additional water from the BRWRF is materially insignificant as compared to the flood flows. Specifically the BRWRF is designed to discharge at most 15 cubic feet per second (CFS) on an average day with a peak of 30 CFS. Beginnings flows (year 2008) will be 6 CFS. These flow rates are substantially less than those reported in the study. The flood flow rates in the study (5-yr flow is 12,919 CFS, and 10-yr flow is 14,856 CFS) are substantially greater the BRWRF discharge rate. The additional discharge from BRWRF will not change the delineation of the flood areas.

Q: What is the expected impact to the water level in Broad Run and the 5-year/10-year flood plain boundaries when the facility is fully operational?

A: There is no expected impact on the delineation of the flood areas.

Q: What contingency plans have been developed to halt or redirect the discharge from this facility during a flood event along Broad Run?

A: Because of the comparatively minimal flows from the BRWRF, there is no need for contingency plans during a flood event; however, BRWRF is designed with equalization basins which will lower the peak flow of the plant to primarily to improve operations, but will coincidentally reduce the maximum flow from the facility during flood events.